

REMARKS

Applicants amend claims 1, 3, and 7, cancel claims 13-23, and add claims 24-26. Claims 1-12 and 24-26 are pending. Applicants request reconsideration and reexamination of the application.

On page 2 of the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 7 as anticipated by or obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,574,062 to Weitman. Because Weitman fails to disclose a contactor where a chiller cools liquid and that liquid and gas flow external to the contact media such that the gas leaves the gas outlet in saturated state, there cannot be anticipation by Weitman. Instead, Weitman chills liquid inside the contact media, and suggests its necessary to bring the air to saturation. Separately, Weitman fails to teach or suggest the controller coupled to the set points, the temperature and humidity sensors, and the computer to adjust the heater and chiller as recited in claim 1. Because there is no suggestion in Weitman of either of these elements, claim 1 would have been unobvious over Weitman. Claim 7 distinguishes over Weitman in similar manner.

On page 3 of the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 7 as unpatentable as applied above and further in view of Izumi (JA 0213136). Applicants submit claims 1 and 7 would not have been obvious over Weitman and Izumi for the earlier reasons. Moreover, the English abstract and drawings show Izumi's refrigerator 29 does not chill the water sprayed into the air circulating in the heat exchanging cyclone 3, but only chills the fluid inside the evaporating tube 30, that is, apparently, what might be considered the contact media. Separately, Izumi does not render claim 1 or 7 obvious, because it does not describe a controller coupled to the set points, the temperature and humidity sensors, and a computer to adjust the heater and chiller as recited in claim 1 and claim 7. Because applicants' representative does not read Japanese, the PTO should decide since it is applying these references to verify or translate Izumi and the other Japanese references to ensure the English abstract is representative of each reference. Applicants reserve their right to supplement the amendment if translations indicate the references have more relevance than can be gleaned from the English abstracts and drawings.

1 On page 3 of the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 7 as unpatentable over the
2 prior art applied above and further in view of Sanpei (JA 5-256468). Applicants submit claims 1
3 and 7 would not have been obvious over Weitman, Izumi, and Sanpei for the reasons stated in
4 the response to the previous grounds of rejection.

5
6 On pages 3-4 of the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 7 as unpatentable over the prior
7 art applied above and further in view of Hashimoto (5,326,316), Takanemi (JA 62-268941),
8 Nishiki (JA 62-77534), or Yamashita (JA 61-24933). Specifically, the Examiner states the
9 references disclose that filters are used in semiconductor clean rooms. Claim 7 is patentable
10 over this ground of rejection for the reasons stated earlier, while claim 7 no longer recites a
11 filter, which appears to make these rejections moot.

12
13 On page 4 of the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as
14 being unpatentable over any of the prior art as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in
15 view of Truhan (3,424,231). Applicants submit the previous remarks address the previous
16 references, so turn to Truhan. Truhan adds nothing more, however, and for example, fails to
17 disclose a chiller cooling liquid such as water and gas such as air flowing through external to the
18 contact media such that the gas or air leaves in saturated state. Instead, as shown in Figure 2,
19 Truhan shows a refrigeration unit 36, which chills water inside a cooling coil 72 in a fluid holding
20 tank 50. Separately, Truhan fails to suggest a controller coupled to the set points, the
21 temperature and humidity sensors, and a computer to adjust the heater and chiller as recited in
22 claim 1. Claim 1 would have been unobvious over Truhan and the other cited references. Claim
23 7 distinguishes in similar manner.

24
25 On page 4 of the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 12 under 35 USC
26 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of the prior art as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and
27 further in view of Curtis (4,044,078). Applicants submit the above remarks address the previous
28 references, so turn to Curtis. The function of Curtis is to provide cold (e.g., 32 degree F) wet air
29 to preserve grocery produce such as grapes, while the function of Weitman is to provide air
30 conditioning in an energy efficient way.

1 If Curtis's saturator were substituted in Weitman, it would result in energy inefficiency, because
2 the relatively hot incoming air of Weitman would be cooled to nearly 32 degrees F as taught by
3 Curtis then reheated back up to a temperature suitable for room air conditioning (AC). This high-
4 low-high temperature process is inconsistent with Weitman's function of energy efficient AC.
5 Second, if we consider Curtis to be the primary reference, it would destroy the function of Curtis
6 to produce cold wet air to preserve produce to tack on the Weitman heater to the cold wet air
7 delivered by Curtis. Separately, Curtis fails to suggest the controller coupled to the set points,
8 the temperature and humidity sensors, and a computer to adjust the heater and chiller as
9 recited in claim 1. Because Curtis suggests neither of these elements, claim 1 would have been
10 unobvious over Curtis and the other references. Claim 7 distinguishes over Curtis in a similar
11 manner.

12
13 On page 4 of the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 3, 7-9, and 12 under 35 USC
14 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of the prior art as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and
15 further in view of Powers (3,533,607). Applicants submit the above remarks address the
16 previous references, so turn to Powers. Powers describes a sprinkler, but fails to describe much
17 more. It fails to disclose water flowing with air through a contactor such that the air leaves the air
18 outlet in saturated state. Instead, Powers describes a cooling tower, which uses the flow of air to
19 cool hot water entering the tower. Separately, Powers fails to suggest the controller coupled to
20 the set points, the temperature and humidity sensors, and a computer to adjust the heater and
21 chiller as recited in claim 1. Because there is no suggestion in Powers of either of these
22 elements, claims 1, 2, 3, 7-9, and 12 would have been unobvious over Powers and the other
23 cited references.

24.
25 On page 5 of the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 7-10, and 12 as unpatentable
26 as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied above and further in view of Asakawa
27 (5,086,829) or Litzberg (4,951,738). Specifically, the Examiner states they teach electronic level
28 sensors. However, they teach nothing more about the subject matters of claims 1 and 7 than
29 any of the previous references, so these claims would have been unobvious over Asakawa and
30 Litzberg.

1 On page 5 of the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 5 and 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as
2 being unpatentable over any of the prior art as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in
3 view of Weibert (2,828,761). Applicants submit the above remarks address the previous
4 references, and that Weibert fails to show anything more than the previous references about the
5 claims, so claims 5 and 11 would have been unobvious over Weibert and the other references.

6
7 Please call if you have a question, comment, or it will expedite progress of the application.

8
9 Respectfully submitted,

10 @PatentPlanet

11
12 Robert Moll

13 Robert Moll

14 Reg. No. 33,741

RECEIVED
JAN 15 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Robert Moll
23 1173 Saint Charles Court
24 Los Altos, CA 94024
25 Tel: 650-567-9153
26 Fax: 650-567-9183
27 Email: rgmoll@patentplanet.com